

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated January 23, 2006 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 14 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claim. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Synopsys Design Compiler Tools ([http://web.archive.org/web/20020814203544/http://www.synopsys.com/products/logic/design\\_compiler.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20020814203544/http://www.synopsys.com/products/logic/design_compiler.html)).

Synopsys merely discloses a device for carrying out a timing verification of a circuit whose design has been completed and after having prepared a description of a Registered Transfer Level (RTL). In particular, Synopsys discloses RTL must be input in order to make a logical connection. However, as claimed in claims 1 and 14, the timing information generating apparatus generates timing information on a non-completed functional block whose design has not yet been completed. However, Synopsys teaches away from the claimed invention since the device for carrying out timing verification is for a circuit whose design has been completed and described at the RTL. In other words, setting a delay time for a function block whose design has not yet been completed cannot be deduced from the design compiler tool of Synopsys.

Since nothing in Synopsys shows, teaches or suggests the timing information generating apparatus for generating timing information on a functional block whose

design has not yet been completed is claimed in claims 1 and 14, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13 would not have been anticipated by or obvious over the *Synopsys* website within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or 35 U.S.C. §103 at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge  
our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: April 21, 2006

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas

Registration No. 32,131

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620